

# **CALIFORNIA STATE ATHLETIC COMMISSION**

## **INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

**Hearing Date: August 15, 2002**

**Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations:**

**Section Affected: 711**

### **Specific Purpose of each adoption, amendment, or repeal:**

**Rule 711:** The specific purpose of this Section is to require every contestant in the open class to wear a headgear that is approved by the Amateur Boxing Federation. Current language specifies that every contestant in the open class may wear a headgear.

This amendment is proposed to ensure the safety of young amateur boxer and martial arts fighters at the age of 18 and under the age of 18. When the language specifies may, it provides these boxers and martial arts fighters with a choice of wearing headgear or not. The Commission believes that for safety reasons and for the best interest of these young fighters and the Commission, they should be required to wear headgear in a boxing or martial arts bout. For the most part these fighters are young and inexperienced and the use of headgear would be an essential required piece of safety equipment for these fighters and added protection against any injuries they may sustain.

### **Factual Basis**

**Rule 711:** The basis for amending this Section is to ensure that young amateur boxing and martial arts fighters of the age of 18 and under are always safe guarded against a major blow to the head by the use of wearing headgear. The protection of wearing headgear definitely outweighs not wearing any at all.

The other reason for amending rule 711 is due to the requirement of the use of headgear for amateur boxing and martial arts fighters under the age of 18 as identified in statute. Section 18766 of the Business and Professions Code requires amateur boxing and martial arts contestants under the age of 18 years to wear protective headgear. Thus, this amendment is also being proposed to correspond with statutory requirement.

### **Underlying Data**

None

### **Business Impact**

This regulation will not have a significant adverse economic impact on businesses.

### **Specific Technologies or Equipment**

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

### **Consideration of Alternatives**

No reasonable alternative which was considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the commission would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

Set forth below are the alternatives which were considered and the reasons each alternative was rejected:

The only alternative to consider is whether to continue to provide these young amateur fighters with the choice of using headgear or not. This is not a feasible alternative as some may chose to do so and be seriously injured as a result. In addition, if the regulatory language remains as is, it won't comply with statute.